



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

father, *arm*, etc., "low-back-wide," with Mr. Bell, or "mid-back-wide," with Mr. Sweet, is inconsistent with the general characteristics of the narrow and wide, as explained by Mr. Bell. In the above indicated place in the organism there is ample room for a vowel station, which needs to be occupied to make the Bell-Sweet system complete, and so occupied relieves the system from some objectionable features. At the same time, the tongue position for the *a* as in *ask* is so nearly like that for the "o" short that only a slight change is needed to pass from one to the other.

The two forms, *Mahomet* and *Mohammed*, are, of course, independent transliterations of the original Arabic. It surely is not an impossibility that, as in the final consonant, so in the vowels, the diversity may have had its origin in a confusion between sounds somewhat resembling each other; and it was not fair to presume that any thing was meant other than this. Not unreasonable objection might indeed have been made to the assumption that the vowels had just the sounds of *o* in *hot* and *a* in *ask*. The form "Mahomet," if not directly from Medieval Latin, may have descended from Mandeville in both the French and the English. I find "Mohammed" and "Mohammedan" in Isaac Taylor's 'Fanaticism,' as printed in New York in 1834,—probably one of the earlier instances of this form in English.

Objection is made to the employment of separate symbols for the vowel in *fern*, *earn*, *sir*, etc, and that in *urn*, *fur*, etc.;—it is an absolute mis-statement that the two are distinguished as narrow and wide. It should have been noticed that the condemnatory dictum passed upon the 'International' is equally applicable to the 'New English Dictionary' by Dr. Murray; since in that work we find two symbols employed in like manner, and with like reasons assigned for so doing: while it is admitted that the discrimination is not made by the majority, there is yet supposed to be a highly respectable minority of those who observe the distinction. It is not fair to presume that authorities, or the opinions of orthoëpists, are ever appealed to in any other sense than as evidence of actual usage.

Some attention ought to have been given to the modifications of the Bell-Sweet system

offered in the "Guide to Pronunciation." They are of so much consequence that, unless they are worthy of acceptance, they are serious faults, deserving of animadversion on the part of the critic. The most important of them are a different place in the vowel-scheme for the *a* as in *arm*, with the *a* as in *ask*; a different explanation of the "mixed" vowels, and the making up of a somewhat different list under this category; also a somewhat more precise explanation of the distinction between the "narrow" and the "wide." These are matters about which, for the most part, one cannot be competent to pass judgment who has not trained himself to observe the action of the organs in producing the sounds of speech.

SAMUEL PORTER.

National Deaf-Mute College.

THE SHAKESPEARIAN DRAMA.

Über Titus Andronicus. Zur Kritik der neuesten Shaksperforschung, von Dr. M. M. ARNOLD SCHRÖER, Professor an der Universität Freiburg, i. B. Marburg in Hessen: Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1891. 8vo, pp. 140.

IN view of the many worthless volumes and essays that have been written upon Shakspeare, there is always some danger lest a new book however genuine its value, be relegated to that enormous category, and fail to receive the recognition it deserves. The book of Prof. Schröer reviews once more the whole much-disputed question of the authorship of "Titus Andronicus." In the Introduction, discussing the value of æsthetic criticism, the author says:

"Wenn sich in einem Jugendwerke eines Dichters, das durch hinreichende äussere Kriterien ihm zugeschrieben wird, die Folgerichtigkeit seiner Charaktere nachweisen lässt, so wird man in dem Werke den Dichter zu erkennen haben, gleichgiltig ob die Verwerthung derselben zum Aufbau des Dramas noch unvollkommen erscheint oder nicht; letzteres lässt sich lernen und entwickeln, ersteres weit weniger. Das Auffassen und Darstellen menschlicher Charaktere hat eine Art der Anschauung zur Voraussetzung, die rein individuell ist, und aus dieser individuellen Anschauungsweise haben wir uns die Individualität des Dichters zu reconstituieren. Dies nenne ich die *Typen seiner Welt- und Menschenanschauung*, und sie durch des Dich-

ters Werke in ihren mannigfaltigen Erscheinungsformen, vom Stofflichen angeregt, doch das Stoffliche sich dienstbar machend, zu verfolgen, müsste die *ästhetischen Kriterien ergeben*."

This the author sets up as the starting point for the æsthetic judgment of the question of Authorship, and is the key-note of his whole book.

For merely practical reasons, he says, he divides his work into two parts—"die äussere" and "die innere Kritik." In the first part he discusses (1) "Ausgaben und Zeugnisse" (2) "Quellenfrage" (3) "Gegenwärtiger Stand der Ansichten über die Autorschaft des Titus Andronicus und Kritik der Behauptungen F. G. Fleay's."

Fleay's reasons for denying the Shakspearean authorship of the play, are taken up one by one and shown to be entirely without foundation. The question of Versification, which is one of Fleay's chief arguments, is discussed at considerable length. "Titus Andronicus" is compared with Marlow's "Jew of Malta," with Kyd's "Spanish Tragedy" and his translation of the "Cornelia," and with "the earliest example of Shakspeare's work," "Love's Labour's lost" and after tabulating his results the author (p. 47) says:

"Also, Mr. Fleay's Behauptung bezüglich der Metrik stellt sich ebenfalls, wenn man der Sache näher nachforscht, als grundverkehrt heraus."

The second part of Prof. Schröers work,— "Innere Kritik," he sub-divides under the rubrics Parallel Passages, Dramatic Motive and third, and most important, "Typische Charaktere." He now takes up the "Spanish Tragedy" attributed to Kyd, and examining it under the first two headings arrives at the result that

"Der Verfasser der *Spanish Tragedy* ist keine dichterische Persönlichkeit, die bei der Verfasserfrage eines Shakspeare zugeschriebenen Stückes ernstlich in Rechnung gezogen werden sollte." (p. 92).

Under the third rubric "Charakterzüge" the author lays stress upon

"Die Idee der Toleranz, aus der ich—um es gleich herauszusagen—seinen *Titus Andronicus* und speciell die Gestalt des *Aaron* als ein Shakspeare'sches Geschöpf erweisen will."

Continuing, he says:

"So wie sich die Toleranz im allgemeinen

aus der Menschenliebe, der liebevollen Betrachtung des Menschlichen ergibt, so erscheint sie im besonderen als Duldsamkeit gegen fremde Rasse, Religion, als humanes Erwägen des Menschlichen in den von der grossen Masse verabscheuten Fremdlingen und Andersgläubigen. Der *Mohr* und der *Jude* sind typische Gestalten bei den Elisabethanern, doch als *Probleme dichterischer Vertiefung und Ausgestaltung sind sie nur für Shakspeare typisch*. Dies ist das wesentlichste Argument, das ich von innern Kriterien für die Shakspeare'sche Verfasserschaft des *Titus Andronicus* geltend zu machen habe: den Zusammenhang der zwei Haupt Charaktere darin, *Titus* und *Aaron* mit anderen Charakteren bei Shakspeare. *Titus* ist ein Verläufer *Lear's*, *Aaron* aber, der interessantere, complicirtere Charakter findet seine Fortsetzung, Variirung und Vertiefung in *Shylock*, in *Richard III*, und in der Tragödie *Othello* zwar vornehmlich in *Othello* Selbst, doch zugleich nach der ursprünglichen Richtung hin variiert in *Iago*." (p. 99.)

The author then proceeds to develop this theory of "Typische Charaktere" with great critical acumen, and with a clearness and a *method* that ranks his book not only as a most important contribution to Shakspearean criticism, but to literary history in general and amply fulfills the task he has set before him:

"Mein Versuch, Shakspeare's Autorschaft für den *Titus Andronicus* nochmals zu erweisen, stellt sich demnach auch die weitere Aufgabe, gewisse Kriterien principiell zu erörtern, die nicht nur für den *Titus Andronicus* und nicht nur für Shakspeare, sondern für die Litteraturgeschichte überhaupt zu gelten haben."

To call attention to a few particulars of Schröer's book we will say that of especial interest are the numerous parallel passages and Dramatic motives here given, inasmuch as many relations between other youthful works of Shakspeare and his dramatic contemporaries are here disclosed; for example, on p. 80, between "Tancred and Gismunda" and Shakspeare's "Romeo and Juliet," on p. 81, between Grune's "Orlando Furioso" and Shakspeare's "Othello," etc. The "Register" at the end enables the reader to find such relations very readily, and we believe that everyone who would occupy himself with Marlowe, Green, Heele, Lodge and the other contemporary dramatists, will find many points in the present work which have not been before observed. Of much interest also,

is the hitherto much underrated Drama, "Lust's Dominion, or the Lascivious Queen" (The Spanish Moor's Tragedy), which is treated at length in the Appendix and its connection with "*Titus Andronicus*," "Othello" and "Richard III." pointed out.

A very instructive review of this book by Prof. Brandt has appeared in the *Göttingischen Gelehrten Anzeigen* of Sept. 1891, pp. 708-728, in which Schröer's investigations of the "Typische Charaktere" are continued.

H. A. RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

ENGLISH POETRY.

The Poems of William Dunbar, edited with Introductions, Various Readings and Notes, by J. SCHIPPER, Ph. D., Parts i and ii. Published by the Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, 1891. 4to, pp. 197.

A critical review of this work will be in place when all its parts are issued; for the present, we must call attention to the admirable plan, and to the accurate work so far laid before us.

English is used throughout in the notes and explanations, as well as in the introduction (Part i) which contains a careful bibliography and plentiful critical material. The text is a piece of luxury, in large, clear type, with ample margins about the quarto page; and the explanatory notes justify the adjective, being historical and comparative as well as philological. Admirable, also, are the remarks prefixed to each poem; such an introduction to the famous "Flying of Dunbar with Kennedy" covers ten pages.

The order of the poems is mainly that followed in Schipper's excellent work, 'William Dunbar, Sein Leben und seine Gedichte,' Berlin, 1884. In this earlier volume, our author showed himself well fitted for his task, giving us an adequate and sympathetic sketch of a poet too often neglected by scholars and too little known by the public. This present edition of Dunbar reflects credit not only upon the scholar who has undertaken it, but also upon the learned body which puts it forth; and it only does justice, luxurious as all its appointments are, to the worth of a poet who alone

among the disciples of Chaucer was worthy to take the laurel from his master's brow.

FRANCIS B. GUMMERE.

Haverford College.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ANGLO-SAXON *gïen(a), gïel(a).*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS: In the MOD. LANG. NOTES for February, Prof. Hart, referring to a communication of mine to the London *Academy* of December 19, states that he doubts if the masc. forms *gïen gïena* can be found in "genuine Wessex texts," and is hence led "to infer that the word is confined to Northern speech," and that I, therefore, "have no right to use a Wessex **gïen* (**gïena*) in support of [my] theory."

Prof. Hart really challenges Sievers to give his "authority" for the use of the forms in his grammar. Prof. Sievers will doubtless answer for himself, but as Prof. Hart seems to imply that I must have gotten the forms from Sievers' grammar, I take it upon myself to reply to his communication.

I am not aware that the forms *gïen gïena* occur in pure W.S. texts. But Grein records seven cases of *gïen* and one of *gïena*, to which should be added, as Prof. Hart suggests, *gïna* "El." 1070, Grein retaining here Thorpe's error, *gena*. We have all learned that it would not do to use the mixed speech of the poetical texts as a basis for grammar-making; but now that the laws of sound-change have been made pretty clear, for W.S. at least, have we no right to make use of the light they shed upon the forms of the poetical text? When in these texts, among the many W.S. forms that are familiar to us from the reading of prose texts, we come upon a form that answers all the requirements of W.S. genuineness, are we to drop it when we find it does not happen to have come down to us in prose texts? In O.E. poetry we have preserved a goodly number of antique words and forms, which the writers of the time were familiar with, but did not use in prose. Surely, Prof. Hart would not assign all these to non-W.S. dialects, particular when they have good W.S. form.